



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

POWERS — RELEASE OF SPECIAL POWERS IN GROSS. — Under a marriage settlement a fund of £60,000 was given in trust to A for life, and after her decease to her issue then living as she might by will appoint, and in default of appointment to her children in equal shares. By deed A covenanted with one of her children not to exercise her power of appointment in such a manner as to reduce his share to less than £7,000, nor so as to postpone the vesting in possession of such share beyond the period of her death. The provisions of the will were inconsistent with this agreement. *Held*, that the covenantee is entitled to £7,000 in possession, not under the deed but as in default of appointment. *In re Evered*, 102 L. T. Rep. 694 (Eng., Ct. of App., April 29, 1910).

For a discussion of the decision in the Chancery Division, see 23 HARV. L. REV. 394.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANIES — RIGHTS AND DUTIES — EXCLUSIVE CONTRACT. — The defendant, a hotel keeper, made a contract with the plaintiff telephone company, giving it the exclusive right to install and maintain a telephone exchange in the hotel. *Held*, that the provision granting the exclusive right is void. *Central N. Y. Telephone & Telegraph Co. v. Averill*, 92 N. E. 206 (N. Y.).

This decision affirms that of the Supreme Court, discussed in 21 HARV. L. REV. 62.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANIES — RIGHTS AND DUTIES — RIGHT TO TURN OFF WATER FOR NON-PAYMENT OF CHARGES. — The defendant city, engaged in furnishing water to its inhabitants, threatened to discontinue service to the plaintiff because of non-payment of charges. There was a *bonâ fide* dispute as to the amount due. *Held*, that the plaintiff may secure an injunction restraining such action, upon filing a bond guaranteeing the payment of any sum found to be owing. *City of Mansfield v. Humphreys Mfg. Co.*, 92 N. E. 233 (Oh.).

When a municipal corporation undertakes to supply its inhabitants with water or gas, it acts not by virtue of any rights of sovereignty but merely in the capacity of a private corporation. *Western Saving Fund Society v. City of Philadelphia*, 31 Pa. St. 175. And since it is engaged in public service, it is under obligation to serve all who come within its profession and tender the necessary charges. *Wood v. City of Auburn*, 87 Me. 287. Some courts have held that service may be discontinued where an undisputed bill remains unpaid. *Jones v. Nashville*, 109 Tenn. 550. But failure to exercise the right of withdrawal immediately, and acceptance of payment for water subsequently furnished, have been held to constitute a waiver of the right. *Wood v. City of Auburn*, *supra*. Other courts have held that non-payment of water rents by a former tenant of premises does not justify the company in refusing service to a new tenant. *Turner v. Revere Water Co.*, 171 Mass. 329. *Contra*, *Gerard Life Insurance Co. v. City of Philadelphia*, 88 Pa. St. 393. Where there is a *bonâ fide* dispute as to the amount due, it is generally held that the company may be enjoined from cutting off the supply. *McEntee v. Kingston Water Co.*, 165 N. Y. 27. In any case it would seem to be a violation of public duty to refuse present service upon tender of regular rates, on the ground of non-payment of past indebtedness.

RECEIVERS — CUSTODY OF PROPERTY BEFORE APPOINTMENT OF RECEIVER. — After a bill to dissolve an insolvent corporation had been filed and process served, but before the appointment of a receiver, property of the corporation was sold on execution, without the permission of the court. *Held*, that the sale was void. *Cobb v. Camden Savings Bank*, 76 Atl. 667 (Me.).

Property is received into the custody of the court impressed with all the exist-